

very finest Members. I was not able to support any of them.

The one amendment that I have literally worked, as he knows, behind the scenes to try to get included in a managers' amendment is this amendment or some variation of this amendment. I think the underlying point you make—if a class action is filed in a State court and that is turned down and there is an effort to move it to Federal court, that is turned down, and then there is another effort to move that class action from State court to Federal court, we limit the second time through. There has to be a response in 60 days to the appeal by the Federal judge on the appeal. That would sort of beg the question, Should not there maybe be some kind of time limit as well on the first time there is an attempt to remove the case to the Federal court? That strikes me as something that makes common sense and seems fair and reasonable. As he knows, I have reached out as recently as last night with some of the people involved in the Judicial Conference and the Rules Committee to see if there is a way to strike the balance, and I believe you have moved toward that balance.

My hope is that we could take this amendment or something similar to this amendment and include it in a managers' package. You have heard Senator DODD and me and others say there is a very delicate compromise here, and there is a concern if we change one piece of the bill we invite friends on the other side, who have a different view about the balance and would like to take the bill in a different direction—we unleash them to feel free to come forth with their amendments and set the bill back.

Having said that, I still think this amendment as you have redrawn it would actually be a good addition to a managers' amendment. I learned today there is not going to be a managers' amendment. As a result, I am not going to be able to support this amendment.

I discussed this this morning with Senator SPECTER; he finds favor with your amendment. I think he mentioned that at the Senate Judiciary Committee hearing. He said to me—and he has no reason to say this, but I think it is just in his heart—he thinks you are onto something here and would like to take the Senator's approach on this provision and include it in another bill that he is working on and presumably will have hearings on.

I think this idea, if it does not pass tomorrow and does not get included in the underlying bill, is going to live for another day and we will be back to where we can hopefully all support it.

I thank the Senator for a real thoughtful approach and for his willingness to compromise and try to find some middle ground. I think he has found it. I think his efforts will ultimately be rewarded.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Delaware for

his kind remarks and for his genuine efforts to try to reach an accord. It is a shame when we have the chairman of the committee admitting that this ought to be dealt with, and one of the great advocates of this legislation admitting that this is just a question of fixing something, we can't get it done. There is something wrong with the way we are proceeding when we can't fix something that basically nobody is really against if we do it right.

I recognize what is likely to happen in the vote. But I take the Senator at his word that he is hoping we can resolve it. Perhaps this is something that can still happen on this bill. If not, we have to resolve it another way. But I thank him for his sincere efforts to solve this problem.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MODERATE ISLAM MOVEMENTS

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago when I talked about relief for the victims of the tsunami in Indonesia and what we are doing there, I said there was much more I wanted to call to the attention of my colleagues and the people of the United States. One area that is extremely important is the enormous effort that is underway in Indonesia's mainstream, moderate Muslim population to promote a moderate, pluralistic, democratic Islam, both in Indonesia and throughout the region.

Unlike the Middle East, in Indonesia and Southeast Asia, Islam and Muslim organizations have been at the forefront of the country's struggle for a democratic society.

And Muslim groups and leaders in Indonesia have been among the world's pioneers in driving inter-faith dialogues.

During my recent visit to Indonesia, I met Yenny Zannuba Wahid, one of the latest leaders in this movement. Yenny is the daughter of His Excellency Abdurrahman Wahid; a Muslim cleric, a leader in promoting religious tolerance in Indonesia and one of Indonesia's first democratically elected presidents.

Yenny has founded the Wahid Institute, an organization dedicated "to bringing justice and peace to the world

by espousing a moderate and tolerant view of Islam and working for the welfare of all."

As Yenny noted in a recent speech, Islamist parties gained a sizable vote in the 1999 and 2004 Indonesian elections; these developments present the question of what role Islamic forces will play in setting the direction of social and political evolution in today's Indonesia. Will Indonesia, a democracy with Muslim population of over 200 million, remain on the path of a moderate, pluralistic democracy or will a small but increasingly influential minority of fundamentalistic Islamists steadily gain ground with the masses?

Through the creation of the Wahid Institute, Yenny has chosen not to allow these currents to flow without resistance. To be precise, the goal of the WI is to expand on the intellectual principles of Gus Dur to development of moderate Islamic thought that will promote democratic reform, religious pluralism, multiculturalism and tolerance amongst Muslims both in Indonesia and around the world. The institute has set out to create a dialogue between the highest spiritual and political leaders in the West and Muslim world.

The Wahid Institute has embarked on an impressive agenda of programs, including an effort to facilitate communication between Muslim and non-Muslim scholars on Islam and Muslim society and on the subjects of Christianity, Judaism, Hinduism and Buddhism; through conferences, discussions, publications and its website—wahidinstitute.org.

The Wahid Institute has plans to build a Muslim library, to serve scholars, researchers, activists, built on the library and life work of President Wahid. It is also planning to link Muslim NGOs and committed individuals to build a network of individuals and groups dedicated to promoting these ideals.

Just as importantly, the Wahid Institute will focus on the education of young people, supporting opportunities for promising young men and women in Indonesia to focus on progressive and tolerant Muslim thinking.

But the Wahid Institute is the latest of the groups committed to promoting moderate Islam. The Liberal Islam Network and International Center for Islam and Pluralism have been hard at work at promoting a peaceful and progressive Islam for sometime. I encourage all to become familiar with these groups.

In neighboring Malaysia, a country with a majority Muslim population of 18 million Muslims, recently elected Prime Minister, Abdullah Badawi, has emerged as a strong voice in promoting ethnic and religious tolerance and equality for women.

His own country struggled through times of violent race riots and has made ethnic and religious tolerance an